

This report is presented in two sections.

Section 1

Section one is a report on the results of the Health Impact Assessment of the proposal to develop the Enler Site on the Ballybeen Estate.

The Health Impact Assessment was conducted on the Six Options for the Enler Site. For the purposes of this report the results of the HIA on Option 5, the preferred option by Williamson Consulting who conducted the economic appraisal on behalf of the Belfast Regeneration Office are included here. The full report on all six options is available from the Belfast Healthy Cities office.

Section 2

Section two is the screening tool which was used in the Ballybeen Community to select the Enler Site development.

Both parts have been written by Erica Ison, Specialist Practitioner in Health Impact Assessment and her permission has been given to reproduce these reports.

***Belfast Healthy Cities:
Community Health Impact Assessment Process***

**Health Impact Assessment of the Proposal
to Develop the Enler Site on the Ballybeen Estate**

***Report written by:
Erica Ison
University of Oxford, Old Road Campus, Old Road, Oxford
OX3 7LF***

Report Author: Erica Ison
HIA Assessor: Erica Ison
Compilers of Community Profile: Jonna Monaghan, Victoria Creasy and Community Steering Group
Project Manager: Victoria Creasy
Belfast Healthy Cities Programme
Director: Joan Devlin

Steering Group

Chair:

Sheelagh Hogg Ballybeen Improvement Group

Members:

Ms Pauline Beattie	NIHE
Mr Billy Brooks	EBCHIP (from March 2004)
Mr Paul Carland	NIHE
Ms Claire Curran	EBCHIP (from June 2004)
Mr William Hobson	Ballybeen Improvement Group (until May 2004)
Ms Tanya Hughes	Ballybeen Womens Centre
Mr Ian Kerr	EBCHIP
Mr David McCartney	Brooklands Primary School
Ms Mavis McCune	Ballybeen Activity Centre
Mr Maurice Meehan	EHSSB
Ms Gabi Mornhinweg	South & East Belfast HSST
Mr Trevor Newman	Millar's Lane Day Centre
Mr Gerry Potts	Ballybeen Improvement Group (until May 2004)
Ms Paula Powell	EBCHIP
Mr David Smyth	Ballybeen Men in Focus
Mr Mike Wilson	Local Strategic Partnership

For more information about the CHIA process, contact Belfast Healthy Cities, 22-24 Lombard Street, Belfast BT1 1RD. Telephone (028) 9032 8811

Contents

Part 1:	Introduction
1.1	What is health impact assessment or HIA?
1.2	What is community-led health impact assessment?
1.3	Community health impact assessment in the Belfast Area
1.3.1	Community health impact assessment process on the Ballybeen Estate
Part 2:	Health impact assessment of the proposal to develop the Enler site on the Ballybeen Estate
2.1	Parameters for the HIA
2.1.1	Aims of the HIA
2.1.2	Objectives of the HIA
2.1.3	Options for appraisal in the HIA
2.1.4	Communities affected by the implementation of the proposal
2.1.4.1	Key facts from the community profile
2.1.4.2	Information from screening the proposal
2.1.4.3	Other conditions or circumstances relevant to the communities affected
2.1.5	Stakeholders in the HIA
2.1.6	Methods of consultation during the appraisal step of the HIA
2.1.7	Governance and accountability for the HIA
2.2	Results of the appraisal
2.2.1	Concerns about the proposal to develop the Enler site
2.2.2	Positive expectations about the proposal to develop the Enler site
2.2.3	Barriers to, and conflicts around, the implementation of the proposal
2.2.4	Potential impacts on health and well-being, and interventions to address those impacts
2.2.4.1	Suggestions to minimise potential negative and enhance potential positive impacts on health and well-being of Option 1, i.e. do nothing
2.2.4.2	Suggestions to minimise potential negative and enhance potential positive impacts on health and well-being of Option 2, i.e. retail outlets only
2.2.4.3	Suggestions to minimise potential negative and enhance potential positive impacts on health and well-being of Option 3, i.e. the provision of day care centre and retail outlets (no community uses of day care centre)
2.2.4.4	Suggestions to minimise potential negative and enhance potential positive impacts on health and well-being of Option 4, i.e. the provision of day care centre and community facilities (no retail outlets)
2.2.4.5	Suggestions to minimise potential negative and enhance potential positive impacts on health and well-being of Option 5, i.e. mixed use – the provision of day care and community facilities, and retail outlets

- 2.2.4.6 Suggestions to minimise potential negative and enhance potential positive impacts on health and well-being of Option 6, i.e. housing only
- 2.2.4.7 General recommendations
- 2.2.4.8 Additional suggestions

Part 3: Assessor's observations

- 3.1 Community awareness of the proposal to develop the Eler site
- 3.2 Perceptions of the different options for the development of the Eler site
- 3.3 Summary comparison of impacts arising from Options 1-6
- 3.4 Concluding remarks
 - 3.4.1 Trade-offs

Part 1: Introduction

In Part 1, we outline what is involved in health impact assessment, and describe the potential for community-led health impact assessment. Finally, we give an introduction to the process of community health impact assessment as originated by Belfast Healthy Cities.

1.1 What is Health Impact Assessment or HIA?

Health impact assessment or HIA has been defined as:

“a combination of procedures or methods by which a policy, programme or project may be judged as to the effects it may have on the health of a population”

WHO European Centre for Health Policy, 1999

The overall purpose of conducting an HIA is, having identified the impacts on health of a particular proposal, to find ways of changing it such that any negative impacts can be minimised or avoided and any positive impacts be maximised or enhanced. The desired outcome is to achieve health gain from both non-health and health-related proposals. However, this outcome cannot be realised unless decision-makers and policy-makers can be persuaded of the usefulness of this approach in general and of any specific recommendations or suggestions coming out of a particular HIA.

In essence, HIA is a tool that can be used to enable decision-makers take account of people's health and well-being during decision-taking. In this sense, HIA is not the answer, but it provides a systematic framework with which to explore all the relevant information, knowledge and experience relating to a proposal's potential effects on the health of a community or population and to take that into consideration together with other priorities during the design, development and/or implementation of any proposal.

1.2 What is Community-led Health Impact Assessment?

In general, in the UK, it tends to be public sector organisations, such as health or regional/local government, that initiate the HIA process. It is uncommon for voluntary sector organisations to initiate it, mainly due to the level of resources required to undertake it, and community-led health impact assessments are rare.

This situation reflects the evolution of the process of community health development (CHD) in the UK since the 1960s (Pulling and Ison, 1999). At first, CHD was a top-down process instigated by central Government. As time went on, local public sector organisations instigated the process but tried to

work with the community. Ultimately, CHD became a bottom-up process with communities instigating and controlling projects and programmes that address their needs and developed their skills.

One of the exciting possibilities for the development of HIA as a methodology is that it will evolve in a similar manner to CHD, whereby communities are not simply consulted or asked to participate but are in control of the HIA process and are able to have direct influence with decision-makers. This overall vision lies at the heart of the work in community health impact assessment undertaken by Belfast Healthy Cities over the last year (2003-2004).

1.3 Community Health Impact Assessment in Northern Ireland

The definition of Community Health Impact Assessment or CHIA originated by Belfast Healthy Cities is as follows:

An approach to health impact assessment, which is community-led and which is guided by the principles of community development

Since 2003, Belfast Healthy Cities has been developing a process for CHIA. Part of the preparation for the development of CHIA process was to select two communities willing to pilot it in relation to one of the proposals to be implemented in their area that would have implications for their health and well-being.

1.3.1 Community Health Impact Assessment Process on the Ballybeen Estate

The community living on the Ballybeen Estate was one of the communities selected to pilot the CHIA process being developed by Belfast Healthy Cities.

As part of the process, members of the community, together with representatives from the statutory and voluntary sectors, were trained in health impact assessment, including some of the skills necessary to undertake it (e.g. facilitation). However, a “learning by doing” approach was taken to training, such that in addition to receiving information about HIA participants were involved in developing and then using a screening tool in order to select a proposal upon which they then undertook the appraisal.

In this report, we present the results thus far of undertaking a community-led health impact assessment on the proposal to develop the Enler site on the Ballybeen Estate in Greater Belfast.

Part 2: Health impact assessment of the proposal to develop the Enler site on the Ballybeen Estate

In Part 2, we outline the parameters for the HIA of the proposal to develop the Enler site on the Ballybeen Estate, including the aims and objectives, the options for appraisal of health impacts, and the communities affected, including vulnerable groups. We also highlight key facts from the community profile of particular relevance to the HIA, and important information from screening the proposal at an earlier stage of the HIA process. We list the main stakeholders for the HIA, and the methods of consultation during appraisal are briefly described. Finally, the governance and accountability mechanisms for the HIA are defined.

The results of the appraisal are then presented, in terms of concerns and positive expectations about the proposal to develop the Enler site, the barriers to, and conflicts around proposal implementation, impacts on health and well-being of each of the six options for the development of the Enler site, and suggestions how to minimise any negative and maximise any positive impacts.

2.1 Parameters for the HIA

2.1.1 Aims of the HIA

The Assessor (EI) set the aims of the HIA as follows:

- To identify the impacts on health and well-being of developing the Enler site on the Ballybeen Estate
- To identify appropriate interventions to address the impacts on health and well-being of the proposal to develop the Enler site on the Ballybeen Estate
- To use the results of the HIA to influence decision-making about the regeneration and redevelopment of the Ballybeen Estate, and in particular the potential redevelopment of the Enler site

2.1.2 Objectives of the HIA

The Assessor (EI) set the objectives of the HIA as follows:

- To assess the impacts on health and well-being of six options for the Enler site on the Ballybeen Estate
- To identify appropriate interventions to address the impacts on health and well-being of the six options for the Enler site on the Ballybeen Estate
- To involve residents on the Ballybeen Estate in the HIA
- To involve the statutory, voluntary and private sectors that serve residents on the Ballybeen Estate in the HIA
- To use the results of the HIA to identify which options for the Enler site may be beneficial to health and well-being of the community

- To inform decision-makers responsible for the regeneration and redevelopment of the Ballybeen Estate of the results of the appraisal of all six options
- To negotiate with decision-makers responsible for the regeneration and redevelopment of the Ballybeen Estate about implementing the appropriate interventions to address health impacts of whichever option for the Enler site is finally selected

2.1.3 Options for appraisal in the HIA

Although the overall proposal is to develop the Enler site, and in so doing relocate retail outlets currently situated in Ballybeen Square, there are six potential options for the Enler site, as laid out in the economic evaluation commissioned by the Belfast Regeneration Office (BRO) from Williamson Consulting.

- Option 1:** Do nothing – the current green field at Enler remains as it is
- Option 2:** Retail outlets only – shops to be the only infrastructure to be built at Enler
- Option 3:** Provision of day-care facility/services and retail outlets – no facility/services for the community
- Option 4:** Provision of day-care facility/services and community facility/services – no retail outlets
- Option 5:** Mixed use – provision of day-care facility/services, community facility/services, and retail outlets
- Option 6:** Housing – only residential units to be built

The Assessor (EI) decided to include all six options in the HIA to ensure consistency among impact assessments of the proposal, and thereby facilitate and enable decision-makers to make comparisons of like with like when considering the results of the impact assessments.

2.1.4 Communities affected by the implementation of the proposal

The communities affected by the potential redevelopment of the Enler site are people living and working in the **Carrowreagh, Enler, and Graham's Bridge wards**.

However, the people who have the potential to be directly affected should the development of the Enler site go ahead are:

- existing residents in the vicinity of the Enler site;
- new residents at the Enler site;
- existing residents in the vicinity of Ballybeen Square;
- new residents at Ballybeen Square;
- business community in Ballybeen Square;
- community groups/organisations in Ballybeen Square.

The people affected by each of the options are shown in Matrix 2.1 below.

Matrix 2.1

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>	<i>Option 4</i>	<i>Option 5</i>	<i>Option 6</i>
Existing residents at Enler	-	X	X	X	X	X
New residents at Enler	-	-	-	-	-	X
Existing residents at Ballybeen Square	X	X	X	X	X	X
New residents at Ballybeen Square	-	X	X	-	X	-
Businesses in Ballybeen Square	X	X	X	X	X	X
Community groups in Ballybeen Square	-	-	-	X	X	-

The vulnerable, marginalized or disadvantaged groups in these communities are shown in Box 2.1.

Box 2.1: Vulnerable groups in the community

- Older people
- Young people
- Children
- People who are unemployed
- People on a low income
- Lone parents and their families
- People who already have a chronic illness
- People who have an acute illness
- People who have mental health problems
- People who are addicted to alcohol
- People who are addicted to drugs
- People who have a physical disability
- People who have a learning disability
- Carers
- People living in the immediate vicinity of any construction works associated with whichever option is implemented
- People who have low educational attainment/low or no skills

2.1.4.1 Key facts from the community profile

A community profile was compiled by Belfast Healthy Cities, and can be obtained from this organisation – see page 2 for contact details.

Key facts about the community living on the Ballybeen Estate summarised from the community profile and of relevance to the HIA include:

- the existence of pockets of disadvantage in the area, which can be masked by the areas of affluence;
- a proportion of the community are vulnerable due to a low level of income;
- there is a high unemployment rate, which has now worsened with the recent closure of the TKEC factory;

- there is poor educational attainment;
- health-damaging behaviours such as alcohol consumption and drug-taking are prevalent particularly among young people on the estate;
- there are many older people in the community who suffer from social isolation;
- There are also people with disabilities living on the estate, for whom access to basic services and facilities is particularly acute.

2.1.4.2 Information from screening the proposal

The potential impacts on health and well-being that gave most cause for concern when identified during the screening step of the CHIA process were construction impacts, as follows:

- increased volume of traffic;
- increased air pollution from heavy goods vehicles making deliveries;
- dust;
- noise pollution;
- vibration;
- disruption to traffic.

These construction impacts were characterised as relatively short term but frequent in their occurrence, and affecting all residents living in the vicinity of the Enler site. In addition, these impacts would probably combine in their effect, and have a greater effect on vulnerable people living nearby, including older people, children, people with a disability, and those who already have an illness or mental health problems.

However, some of the impacts arising from the operation of a new development at the Enler site also gave cause for concern, including:

- increased volume of traffic;
- increased air pollution from heavy goods vehicles making deliveries;
- noise pollution;
- vibration;
- disruption to residents' access to parking;
- an increase in crime and antisocial behaviour;
- an increase in fear of crime and antisocial behaviour.

Impacts relating to crime and fear of crime, and antisocial behaviour and fear of antisocial behaviour, were of considerable concern in that residents on the estate feel that currently the level of policing currently available is inadequate. Thus, any increase in criminal or antisocial activity would be noticeable and uncontrolled, and therefore have a greater impact.

2.1.4.3 Other conditions or circumstances relevant to the communities affected

During the appraisal, participants in the HIA notified the Assessor (EI) of other potential redevelopments that might also affect the communities involved:

- building on part of the park;
- Brooklands site

During the training in CHIA, it was announced that the TKEC factory opposite the estate, and at which over 150 residents were employed, was to close.

2.1.5 Stakeholders in the HIA

In HIA, a stakeholder is anyone involved with or affected by the proposal. Stakeholders for the HIA of the proposal to develop the Enler site are shown in Box 2.2.

Box 2.2: Stakeholders in the HIA

- Residents in Carrowreagh, Enler and Graham's Bridge wards
- Landmark East
- Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE)
- Department for Social Development (DSD)
- Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety (DHSSPS)
- South and East Belfast HSS Trust (SEBT)
- Ballybeen Improvement Group (BIG)
- IFI
- Belfast Regeneration Office (BRO)
- Police Service Northern Ireland (PSNI)
- South and East Belfast Education and Library Board (SEELB)
- Castlereagh Borough Council
- Enler Steering Committee
- Millars Lane Day Centre
- Youth services
- Social services
- Brooklands Primary School
- Dundonald Primary School
- Dundonald High School
- Castlereagh College
- Local businesses at Ballybeen Square: Post Office, Mace, Bairds Chemists, Kismet Hairdressers, Menzies
- Voluntary and community sector organisations on the Ballybeen Estate: Ballyoran Youth Club, BYTES, Best Cellars, Boys' Brigade, Girls' Brigade, Guides, Scouts, EBCHIP
- Ballybeen Activity Centre
- Dungoyne Community Centre
- Ballybeen Women's Centre
- Ballyoran Centre
- Faith representatives: St Mary's Church; Dundonald Methodist Church; Salvation Army; Dundonald Presbyterian Church; Christ Church Presbyterian Church; Brooklands Gospel Hall
- Age Concern
- Engage with Age
- Public and community transport providers

2.1.6 Methods of consultation during the appraisal step of the HIA

For this HIA, two consultation events were organised based on the use of rapid appraisal techniques:

1. an open event targeted at residents on the estate, held at Brooklands Primary School on the evening of 5 May 2004;
2. a participatory stakeholder workshop to which members of the community, the statutory sector, the voluntary sector and the private sector were invited held at the Ballyoran Centre on the morning of 6 May 2004.

The general structure and organisation of an open event is described in Ison (2004) and of a participatory stakeholder workshop is described in Ison (2002).

At both events the following questions were put to participants:

- ⇒ What are your concerns about redevelopment of the Enler site?
- ⇒ What are your positive expectations about the redevelopment of the Enler site?
- ⇒ What are the impacts on health and well-being (positive and negative) of each of the six options for the Enler site?
- ⇒ What interventions should be used to address the impacts on health and well-being of each of the six options for the Enler site?

In addition, participants at the stakeholder workshop were asked:

- ⇒ What are the barriers to, and conflicts around, the implementation of the proposal to develop the Enler site?

During the open event, there were a variety of ways in which participants could express their views: expressing their views on a Graffiti Wall (concerns and positive expectations), questionnaire (all questions), discussion with facilitator (impacts of 6 options for appraisal), and expressing their views around a map of the estate (facilities they would like to see included in the development of the Enler site).

During the workshop, participants expressed their views as individuals on a Graffiti Wall (concerns and positive expectations), as a group during brainstorming (barriers and conflicts), and by working in small groups (impacts and interventions).

2.1.7 Governance and accountability for the HIA

The HIA was conducted under the guidance and direction of a Steering Group, the same Steering Group as that in overall charge of piloting the CHIA process, including overseeing the compilation of the community profile. Members of the Steering Group are shown on page 2 of this report.

2.2 Results of the appraisal

The results from both consultation events have been combined and are reported below in the main body of the text. Transcript of responses at the open event and for that at the participatory stakeholder workshop are available.

The results are reported under the following headings:

1. concerns about the proposal for redevelopment of the Enler site;
2. positive expectations about the proposal for redevelopment of the Enler site;
3. barriers to, and conflicts around, the implementation of the proposal;

4. impacts of each of the six options for the Enler site, together with suggestions about ways to minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts.

2.2.1 Concerns about the proposal to develop the Enler site

The concerns expressed by participants about the proposal to develop the Enler site are shown in Box 2.3.

Box 2.3: Concerns about the proposal to develop the Enler site

Construction impacts from any form of development

- Noise pollution
- Increase in the amount of dust
- People most affected will be living round the site &/or attending/using St Mary's Church

Demands on infrastructure

- Increased demand on existing infrastructure, e.g. water supply and sewerage, roads

Potential environmental impacts of operation of completed development

- Noise pollution
- Air pollution, including emissions from vehicles
- Offensive odours arising from food preparation at a fast food outlet, e.g. chip shop
- Loss of view with the construction of a three-storey building
- Litter
- Graffiti
- Vandalism

Volume of traffic generated and associated pressure on parking

- Increase in volume of traffic from goods deliveries to shops & increased public transport
- Increase in number of non-residents parking in the area
- Difficulty with parking for residents due to use of spaces by visitors and goods vehicles
- Increase in risk of accidents for children, particularly road traffic accidents

Community safety

- Increase in crime, e.g. theft from shops
- Increase in antisocial behaviour
- Increase in vandalism
- Speculation that level of policing necessary to control potential increase in crime and antisocial behaviour will not be made available
- Lack of control over young people on the estate
- Off licence/betting shop could be included, promoting antisocial/health-damaging behaviours

Consultation

- Lack of consultation with residents at Enler and Ballybeen Park & Square

Property value

- Devaluation of property in the immediate vicinity of site development

Social capital

- Potentially, the loss of a community asset to a private developer

Amenity

- Loss of green space on the estate – the field at the Enler site will be the only one remaining on the estate if the Brooklands site is developed

Commitment to redevelopment

- Fear for some residents that the Enler site will not be redeveloped
- Fear for some residents that the Enler site will be redeveloped
- No sense of ownership felt by community

Financing

- Availability of revenue for maintaining and sustaining community uses

Management of mixed use site

- Potential conflict among organisations/businesses operating from the Enler site

2.2.2 Positive expectations about the proposal to develop the Enler site

Positive expectations about the proposal to develop the Enler site are shown in Box 2.4.

<p>Box 2.4: Positive expectations about the proposal to develop the Enler site</p> <p><u>Employment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase in the number of jobs for local people <p><u>Environment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved appearance of immediate vicinity of Enler <p><u>Services, facilities and amenities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An integrated approach to the provision of services, facilities and amenities• Provision of a meeting place• Provision of an innovative community facility• Provision of a new purpose-built day care centre• Provision of medical facilities including both traditional and alternative therapies• Potential for outreach work• Provision of youth facilities• Provision of a homework centre• Provision of childcare facilities• Improved retail shopping• Potential for a theatre <p><u>Community safety</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policing (on foot or by bicycle) on a regular basis <p><u>Social capital</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Developing a new heart for the estate• Community coming together• Improving the estate for now and for future generations – making it a better place, improving the appearance• Providing a place where children can have fun• Giving the estate a boost• Community development• Greater involvement of residents

2.2.3 Barriers to, and conflicts around, implementation of the proposal

The following **barriers** to the development of the Enler site were identified:

- objections from local residents;
- apathy or a lack of desire on behalf of some members of the community to be involved in the process of regeneration and redevelopment;
- lack of information provided to the community about the plans to regenerate and redevelop the estate;
- lack of consultation with the community about the plans to regenerate and redevelop the estate, especially people living in the immediate vicinity of the Enler site;
- potential for antisocial behaviour and vandalism during construction and during operation of the new development;
- potential shortfall in funding to realise some of the options for redevelopment, such as the mixed use option.

The following **conflicts** around the development of the Enler site were identified:

- the nature of retail and other outlets to be introduced on the site – there are fears that businesses will be introduced that encourage antisocial and health-damaging behaviours, e.g. an off licence, or a betting shop;
- the status of Ballybeen Square for residents on the estate – some people already view it as the “heart” of the estate, whereas others see the development of the Enler site as the new “heart” of the estate, and the focal point for future regeneration;
- the closure of Millar’s Lane Day Centre – some members of the community feel that the existing facility should be upgraded rather than building a new facility whereas the Trust deem it necessary to build a new day centre in order to provide the level of service at the right quality for older people living on the estate;
- who will experience the greatest harm and who will experience the greatest benefit – for five out of six of the options in the appraisal, the residents in the immediate vicinity of the Enler site will suffer most if not all of the negative impacts during both the construction and the operation of a developed site, whereas residents elsewhere on the estate will be more likely to experience the benefits of at least four out of six of the options and any negative impacts at a lesser intensity or possibly some of them not all;
- in addition to the basic facilities/amenities covered in some of the options, different residents or groups of residents (e.g. young people and older people) would like to see different uses of the site ranging from a community garden to a Go Kart track;
- Government policy on the use of any monies derived from the sale of land at Ballybeen Square – many in the community would like to see at least a proportion of the money used in the regeneration of the estate and the development of the community;
- if residential units are built at either the Enler site or Ballybeen Square, the potential tension between owner-occupiers and those people who are renting their accommodation.

2.2.4 Potential impacts on health and well-being, and interventions to address those impacts

The potential impacts on health and well-being were identified for the six options for the Enler. Underneath each table were suggestions made to address the impacts associated with each option, i.e. by minimising any negative and maximising any positive impacts.

The result of the HIA are included here on Option 5, the preferred option of the economic appraisal conducted by Williamson Consulting on behalf of BRO.

Table 2.5: Identification of Potential Impacts associated with Option 5 – Mixed use, i.e. the provision of day care and community facilities and retail and other outlets

<i>Positive aspects of Option 5</i>	<i>Potential positive impacts on health & well-being</i>	<i>Negative aspects of Option 5</i>	<i>Potential negative impacts on health & well-being</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Relocated and rebuilt outlets for retail and other businesses in an improved environment ◇ Increased capacity for retail and other outlets ◇ Site becomes a natural hub/interchange for meeting people ◇ Improvements to road infrastructure in this part of the estate ◇ Likelihood that the Post Office will be established with another proprietor at the Enler site ◇ Improved access to and quality of day 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Attraction of new customers from the estate or elsewhere, with the possibility of increasing sales volume/income for retailers, and thereby increasing the profitability and viability of businesses serving the estate, which may also encourage the retention of money in the local economy - hallmark of a sustainable community; reduced likelihood that environment will be vandalised due to improved appearance thereby reducing fear of crime and antisocial behaviour; rental from retail outlets part of revenue source to sustain the community facility ◇ Attraction of new retailers to the site potentially widening the range of goods and services available to the community; rental from retail outlets part of revenue source to sustain the community facility ◇ Increased social contact, which may lead to increased social support and reduced social isolation, particularly for the older people on the estate; social cohesion and integration may also increase ◇ Improved access to local area for residents and their visitors, which may increase social contact and therefore social support, and thereby increase mental well-being ◇ Retention of services valuable to the community, thereby maintaining access; retention of an important 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of new retail outlets and day care centre at the Enler site; construction of residential units at Ballybeen Square • Increased capacity for retail and other outlets • Loss of amenity that is currently provided by green field • Loss of aesthetic value currently provided by green field • Increased volume of traffic, arising from influx of staff and other visitors to the day care centre, from users of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease in air quality from increased levels of dust, and increased level of pollutants from HGV lorries associated with construction, which will affect respiratory health especially in children and older people; increase in noise levels from construction which will affect levels of concentration in residents living in the vicinity • Potential for other businesses to be introduced into the estate that may attract antisocial and/or health-damaging behaviours, such as an off-licence, a betting shop or takeaway food outlet – this may increase fear of antisocial behaviour and crime, and thereby increase anxiety, stress and social isolation especially of older people, and increase the opportunity for young people to take up health-damaging behaviours, e.g. alcohol consumption • Loss of space for physical activity and play, which will reduce cardiovascular fitness, may increase levels of obesity, and impair childhood development • Loss of view for residents in the immediate vicinity, and loss of a pleasant environment, will remove a resource from the community that has the power to alleviate stress and induce feelings of calm and well-being; this may exacerbate the effect of other negative impacts

<p>care, healthcare and other facilities and services for older people on the estate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Potential to provide healthcare and health promotion services ◇ Increased potential for employment of local people in both the retail units and the day care centre <p>◇ Potential for community to feel ownership of the community facility</p> <p>◇ Increased availability of and access to community facilities and activities</p> <p>◇ Increased opportunities for local people to undertake volunteer activities in the local community</p>	<p>meeting place for members of the community, thereby maintaining social contact and social support especially for older people</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Better health protection for older people; potential to improve the health and well-being of older people on the estate; increased social contact and support ◇ Health protection and health improvement for residents on the estate ◇ Improved physical and mental well-being through employment mediated by an increase in income and self-esteem and confidence, although if the nature of the job is such that the employee has low level of control and low income this positive effect may be negated ◇ Increased level of control in life of individuals, and life of community, decreasing apathy and increasing self-esteem and confidence which may encourage further community participation; it may also help to generate pride in belonging to the community and/or estate; this may also have a positive influence on civic participation and democratic renewal, e.g. taking part in elections ◇ Potential for social and educational skills development which will enhance self-esteem, and life opportunities and thereby have an effect on mental and physical health and well-being; increase in social contact, networking and support; an increase in social capital for the community; potential for physical activity and exercise increasing cardiovascular fitness and 	<p>community facilities during evenings/night-time, and from customers and goods vehicles making deliveries to retail outlets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in number of people parking in the area • Uncertainty about whether affordable housing (i.e. that for social renting, and that for key or essential workers or people who have intermediate incomes) will be included in the new build at Ballybeen Square • Vandalism of the built environment at Enler site • Focal point for antisocial behaviour (ASB), and crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased risk of road traffic accidents, and therefore physical injuries; decrease in air quality from vehicle emissions which will affect respiratory health, especially in the vulnerable e.g. children and older people; increased level of noise which may affect ability to concentrate and could increase the potential for accidents both in and out of the home • Residents may have reduced access to parking causing stress, and for those who have reduced levels of mobility difficulties gaining easy access to their home and/or vehicle • A lack of affordable housing units at Ballybeen Square would mean that local people will probably not be able to afford them, and it would also not be possible to attract key workers (nurses, teachers, police, etc.) to the area, which may affect not only the capacity to deliver services in the area but also the quality of those services, which could then have a further impact on people's physical and mental health • Damage to various properties in and around site, causing increased expenditure for property owners on repairs thereby reducing disposable income possibly on a repeated basis; reluctance of customers to visit retail and other outlets, decreasing their access to basic goods and services and reducing the viability of those outlets with a concomitant effect on the local economy; deterioration of the environment encourages further neighbourhood incivilities, increasing
--	--	---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Potential for intergenerational contact and activities due to co-location of day care centre and community facility open to young people ◇ Ballybeen Square becomes available for redevelopment as residential units ◇ Increase in the number of children and young people attending local schools ◇ Increase in number of residents who are owner occupiers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reducing obesity ◇ Skills development and improved self-esteem which may increase likelihood of gaining employment or improving the quality of employment with the concomitant effect on the mental and physical health of not only individuals but also their families ◇ Increased social contact and support for both older and young people, two of the most vulnerable groups on the estate, which will increase self-esteem, confidence and mental well-being; it could also have a role to play in reducing the opportunity and desire in young people to take part in antisocial or health-damaging behaviour, which will have knock-on positive effects for other residents on the estate, and increase social capital in the community ◇ Meets Government policy for new housing build; increase in amount of housing stock, and improvement in housing conditions, thereby helping to enhance physical and mental well-being of those who are able to obtain it; potential increase in the amount of housing available for social renting which will help to improve the health and well-being of those on a low income; improvements to the built environment which may discourage vandalism and neighbourhood incivilities and also discourage antisocial behaviour, thereby encouraging social contact and networking, increasing social support and social capital – it may also increase property values in the area ◇ Potential increase in social contact, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deposition of litter and other rubbish • Decrease in property values at the Enler site • Community facilities/services provided at Enler site 	<p>social isolation and the consequent effect on mental health and well-being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents experience antisocial behaviour (ASB) which affects their mental health and well-being, and, through fear of ASB & crime, may contribute to social isolation particularly in older people; retailers and employees suffer from effects of crime including loss of profit and the effects of a reduction in income; there is also the potential for physical injury as a result of crime • Encourages further neighbourhood incivilities, including vandalism; may attract vermin • Ballybeen Estate, but the need to move may be exacerbated by other negative impacts of redevelopment – this may result in residents experiencing stress from negative equity or from feeling trapped in a negative situation without the power to change it, which can have a detrimental effect on both mental and physical health • Community facilities in Ballybeen Square may be subject to decreased usage, which may then affect viability and funding, and if unsustainable loss of facilities at this location altogether – this could have a negative impact on those users who are able to attend only Ballybeen Square through e.g. reduced mobility, and ultimately reduce social capital in this part of the estate
---	---	---	---

<p>◇ Enler site becomes a focal point for the regeneration and renewal of the Ballybeen Estate</p>	<p>networking and support for young people, which would improve their mental well-being and may prevent the uptake of antisocial or health-damaging behaviours</p> <p>◇ Potential to boost the local economy, and therefore help to make the community more sustainable; likelihood that individual properties will be better maintained and thereby enhance the possibility of discouraging neighbourhood incivilities, and vandalism</p> <p>◇ Improved reputation for the estate; increase in pride and self-esteem for residents and an increase in social capital for the community</p>		
--	---	--	--

2.2.4.5 Suggestions to reduce the negative impacts and increase the positive impacts on health and well-being of Option 5, i.e. mixed use, the provision of day care and community facilities, and retail outlets

- ❖ Conduct a Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) as part of the process towards obtaining planning permission for this development
- ❖ Use the results of the TIA to design and plan a system of traffic management for the site, taking into consideration access routes, delivery schedules/needs, public or community transport provision, parking requirements for residents and non-residents (visitors to site), the need for traffic calming, and the integration of active transport options (i.e. walking and cycling) such as the development of cycle paths to the Enler site
- ❖ Design and implement a system of parking controls that will ensure development can be serviced by goods vehicles and visited by non-residents but does not compromise the reasonable parking needs of residents in the vicinity of the Enler site
- ❖ Encourage the uptake of walking and cycling as active transport options for all members of the community
- ❖ Develop a Code of Construction Practice to manage the impacts of construction on residents in the vicinity of both construction sites; there are many good practice examples available – consider the installation of double/acoustic glazing (as appropriate) in properties in the immediate vicinity of both construction sites
- ❖ Incorporate areas of green space into the development plans for the Enler site
- ❖ In close liaison with PSNI, design the location of the new day care/community centre and retail outlets in accordance with the principles of Designing Out Crime (e.g. no alleyways)
- ❖ When designing the day care centre, try to build in capacity for future needs (using principles similar to Lifetime Homes)
- ❖ When designing the build of the new residential units, use the principles of Homes for Life/Lifetime Homes
- ❖ Establish a programme for regular maintenance of the fabric of the whole site, including the retail outlets

- ❖ Establish a Management Committee to help develop, in collaboration with other stakeholders, a policy and set of standards for the running of the entire facility, to oversee the running of the community facilities at the Enler site, and to take part in co-ordinating all of the community facilities on the estate – consider the need for/suitability of establishing a post for a liaison officer to work with the various stakeholders on site
- ❖ Take an inclusive approach to the planning and management of the community facilities, and identify community groups who would want to take space/use the facility – consider the possibility of establishing a system of affiliation for community groups taking space in/using the facilities
- ❖ Negotiate affordable rental for community groups based in/using the community facilities
- ❖ Explore the potential to use community facility for training and skills development in the community
- ❖ Explore the potential to include the following services/agencies at the community facility: CAB, DHSS, NIHE Information, Job Centre, Community Police, Credit Union, Samaritans, Bytes, Castlereagh College, Open Learning, Internet café and support
- ❖ Explore the potential to provide the following health or health-related services at the Enler site: healthy living centre, health outreach work, and a community pharmacist
- ❖ Consider the appropriateness of introducing services into the facility that are supported by other sources of external funding, e.g. a community cafe
- ❖ Consider introducing a system of Restorative Justice when dealing with young people who take part in antisocial behaviour and/or crime – consider the use of creative solutions whereby key members of the community work in co-operation with the police and young people
- ❖ Negotiate the build of a proportion of affordable housing on Ballybeen Square
- ❖ Consult with and include local residents in discussion about the nature of the retail and other outlets to be built at Enler site, and ensure a range of retail outlets meeting people's needs is available– consider the use of an incentive scheme to attract those businesses/outlets that the community need and would use
- ❖ Negotiate with the business proprietors of new retail outlets the take over the Post Office to keep this facility on the estate
- ❖ Consult with young people about the nature of the facilities and activities they would like to have available to them through the community centre, and involve them in planning at an early stage
- ❖ Encourage the provision and uptake of road safety training for children, especially in local schools
- ❖ Encourage the provision of educational programmes about litter management in local schools; as part of this process consider the organisation of school litter teams
- ❖ Consider the employment of young people who live locally to keep the site clean
- ❖ Explore the potential to introduce a street warden scheme, similar to those developed by local government in England; this could be provided within the Neighbourhood Management Project

2.2.4.7 *General recommendations*

In addition to the specific recommendations made in relation to each option for the development of the Enler site, a set of general recommendations have been formulated that apply

- ❖ Improve information provision to the residents on Ballybeen Estate about the proposal to develop the Enler site
- ❖ Raise awareness of the development of the Enler site, and the redevelopment of Ballybeen Square
- ❖ Incorporate the redevelopment of Ballybeen Square into the Neighbourhood Management Project
- ❖ Consult widely with residents on the Ballybeen Estate throughout the planning and development process of the proposal to develop the Enler site/redevelop Ballybeen Square; set up consultations at a local or localised level, e.g. organise street meetings within 6-7 local patches on the estate
- ❖ Ensure young people on the estate are consulted, and involve them in the decision-making process
- ❖ Consult with Environmental Services about the impacts of the options to develop the Enler site/redevelop Ballybeen Square
- ❖ Disseminate the results of the HIA to the residents of Ballybeen Estate, and to organisations and agencies, whether public, voluntary or private, involved in providing services to those residents
- ❖ Review levels of policing on the estate, and assess whether current levels are appropriate and effective
- ❖ Review the needs for services, facilities and amenities among existing residents on the Ballybeen Estate, and assess the needs of future residents if Options 2-6 are implemented

2.2.4.8 Additional suggestions

Other facilities or amenities suggested by participants in the HIA that could be included in the development of the Enler site are shown in Box 2.5. These suggestions could be entered into the review of residents' needs as recommended in Section 2.2.4.7.

Box 2.5: Facilities or amenities participants suggested could be included in the development of the Enler site

- Sports Centre
- Netball Court
- Basketball Court
- Go kart track
- Indoor bowls
- Indoor football
- Leisure Centre or leisure facilities
- Recreation Centre
- Facilities for young people
- Children's art centre
- Community garden
- Park
- Health services, including:
 - Doctor
 - Optician
 - Chiropodist
 - Child Health Centre
- Internet café

If housing has to be built:

Housing designed for the needs and capacities of older people, e.g. bungalows

Part 3: Assessor's observations

3.1 Community awareness of the proposal to develop the Enler site

During the consultation events for the HIA, it was clear that many residents were unaware of the proposal to develop the Enler site. Among those who were aware of the possibility, there was a lack of accurate information. This lack of information has resulted in ignorance and uncertainty in the community. In this situation, it is also possible for people to be misinformed.

Many people said they had not been consulted about the proposal to develop the Enler site, and, apart from members of the Steering Group for the HIA, no participant was aware of the economic appraisal of the proposal conducted by Williamson Consulting on behalf of the Belfast Regeneration Office (BRO).

Given the lack of information about the proposal (or any of the options), and the patchy nature of consultation thus far, it is important that the general recommendations in Section 2.2.4.7 are implemented.

3.2 Perceptions of the different options for the development of the Enler site

The general message from members of the community who participated in the HIA was that they wanted more facilities and amenities on the estate, particularly community facilities, rather than more housing. Thus, Option 6, development of the Enler site as residential units, was not popular, and many people felt that it was not viable because there was already a need for facilities and amenities on the estate and the construction of more housing would only exacerbate this need (not meet it) and increase demand.

However, there appears to be a divide between residents who would like to see the Enler site developed (Options 2-5, but particularly Option 5) and the retail outlets moved from Ballybeen Square, and another group of residents who do not want to see the Enler site developed (Option 1) but for different reasons, for example, some see Ballybeen Square as the heart of the estate and do not want that to be changed, whereas others want to retain the green field at Enler. At present, it is not possible to quantify the number of residents in favour of do nothing (Option 1) and the number in favour of development (Options 2-5, but particularly Option 5).

There also appears to be a divide among residents with respect to the provision of day care facilities, for instance, some people do not want the Millars Lane Day Centre closed but upgraded, whereas others want a new facility to be built, as planned by the Trust.

Several people at both events questioned whether Option 4 – the provision of day care and community facility/services only – was viable because it does not include the retail and other outlets that would be a source of income for the maintenance of the community facility/services. This perception is supported by the findings of the economic appraisal.

Some people considered Option 5 – mixed use – to be the most sustainable. This perception is supported by the findings of the economic appraisal.

Some individuals were concerned about the use of public money to support and subsidise private businesses with the relocation of the retail outlets to the Enler site (Options 2, 3 and 5).

3.3 Summary comparison of impacts arising from the implementation of Options 1-6

In order to identify the differences between the impacts of various options, I have compiled several matrices of the main impacts already identified in Tables 2.1-2.6.

In Matrix 3.1, I present a summary of the potential positive impacts of the various options, and in Table 3.1 the ranking of each option according to the number of potential positive impacts. In Matrix 3.2, I present a summary of the potential negative impacts, and in Table 3.2 the ranking of each option according to the number of potential negative impacts.

Matrix 3.1: Summary of potential positive impacts of the various options for the development of the Enler site

<i>Potential Positive Impact</i>	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>	<i>Option 4</i>	<i>Option 5</i>	<i>Option 6</i>
Site for physical activity and exercise	√	-	-	?	?	-
Meeting point for residents	√	√	√	√	√	-
Site for children's play	√	-	-	?	?	-
Green space/pleasant environment	√	-	-	-	-	-
Pleasant view	√	-	-	-	-	-
Relocated and rebuilt retail outlets	-	√	√	-	√	-
Increased capacity for retail	-	√	√	-	√	-
Improvements to road infrastructure in area	-	√	√	√	√	?
Likelihood of keeping Post Office	?	√	√	?	√	?
Increase in employment opportunities	-	√	√	√	√	-
Increase in number of residential units	-	√	√	-	√	√
Increase in the number of owner occupiers	-	√	√	-	√	√
Increase in the number of children and young people attending local schools	-	√	√	-	√	√
Increase in access and quality of day care	-	-	√	√	√	-
Potential to provide health services for all	-	-	?	?	√	-
Increase in access to community facilities	-	-	-	√	√	-
Increase in volunteering opportunities	-	-	-	√	√	-
Increase in opportunities for intergenerational contact	-	-	-	√	√	-
Potential for community ownership	-	-	-	√	√	-
Retail outlets remain in Ballybeen Square	√	-	-	-	-	√
Enler site becomes a focal point for regeneration of Ballybeen Estate	-	-	?	?	√	-
TOTAL	6	9	10	8	16	4

Table 3.1: Ranking of options by number of potential positive impacts [NB: ranking is by most number of positive impacts]

Option	<i>Rank</i>
1	5
2	3
3	2
4	4
5	1
6	6

Matrix 3.2: Summary of potential negative impacts of the various options for the development of the Enler site

Potential Negative Impact	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
Risk of road traffic accidents	X	X	X	X	X	X
Potential location for annual bonfires	X	-	-	-	-	-
Location for rubbish dumping	X	-	-	-	-	-
Poor access to green-field site for all residents on estate		-	-	-	-	-
Relocation of day care facilities	X	X	-	-	-	X
Loss of retail outlets	?	-	-	?	-	?
Loss of inward investment in estate	X	X	X	X	-	X
Loss of opportunity to promote community ownership	X	X	X	-	-	X
Construction impacts	-	X	X	X	X	X
Potential for introduction of outlets that promote antisocial or health-damaging behaviours (e.g. off licence, turf accountant)	-	X	X	-	X	-
Loss of amenity from green-field site	-	X	X	X	X	X
Loss of aesthetic quality of green-field site	-	X	X	X	X	X
Increase in the volume of traffic	-	X	X	X	X	X
Increase in the demand for parking	-	X	X	X	X	X
Vandalism at the Enler site	-	X	X	?	X	?
Focal point for antisocial behaviour & crime	X	X	X	?	X	?
Littering	X	X	X	X	X	X
Decrease in property values at Enler site	-	X	X	X	X	X
Loss of employment opportunities	X	-	-	-	-	X
Loss of Post Office facilities	X	-	-	X	-	X
Vandalism at Ballybeen Square	X	-	-	X	-	X
Degraded environment remains at Ballybeen Square	X	-	-	X	-	X
Retail outlets remain in Ballybeen Square	X	-	-	X	-	X
Lack of retail outlets at Enler site to support community facilities/services	N/A	-	-	X	-	N/A
Competition between community facilities & services at Enler site and Ballybeen Square	-	-	-	X	X	-
Potential loss of community facilities at Ballybeen Square	-	?	?	?	?	-
Loss of opportunity to increase access to community facilities and activities	X	X	X	-	-	X
Loss of opportunity for intergenerational contact	X	X	X	-	-	X
Increased demand for facilities, amenities and services that cannot be met by planned infrastructure within the option	-	X	X	X	-	X
Lack of affordable housing at Enler site	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X
Lack of affordable housing at Ballybeen Square	N/A	X	X	X	X	X
Loss of opportunity to increase the number of residential units	X	-	-	?	-	-
TOTAL	16	18	17	17	11	21

Table 3.2: Ranking of options by number of potential negative impacts [NB: ranking is by least number of negative impacts]

Option	Rank
1	2
2	5
3	=3
4	=3
5	1
6	6

As can be seen from Tables 3.1 and 3.2, Option 5 – mixed use – is the highest ranked option in terms of most number of potential positive impacts and least number of potential negative impacts, and Option 6 – housing only – is the worse ranked for both categories.

Of all the impacts identified in Tables 2.1-2.6, whether positive or negative, it is possible to attach a weighting to some of them. In Matrix 3.3, I present the weightings associated with some of the impacts of Options 1-6.

Matrix 3.3: Weighting associated with key impacts from the implementation of Options 1-6

Impact	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
Construction impacts	-	XX	XX	X	XX	X
Potential for vandalism/antisocial behaviour	XX	X	X	XX	X	X
Investment in estate infrastructure	XXX	√XX	√√X	√√X	√√√	XXX
Employment opportunities for local people	XX	√X	√√	√X	√√	XXX
Demand in relation to infrastructure	?XX	√XX	√√X	√√X	√√√	XXX
Potential for meeting other residents	√	√	√√	√√	√√√	√
Number of residential units	X	√	√	X	√	√√*
Number of owner occupiers on estate	X	√	√	X	√	√√*
Number of children attending local schools	X	√	√	X	√	√√*
TOTAL (wholly positive impacts)	1(√)	4	5	1(√√)	7	4

* On the assumption that more residential units can be built at the Enler site than at Ballybeen Square

Table 3.3: Ranking of options according to weighting of key impacts

Option	Rank
1	6
2	=3
3	2
4	5
5	1
6	=3

In terms of weighted impacts, Option 5 is the best in the ranking. It is positive for 7 of 9 categories, and has the greatest positive weighting for 4 of 7 categories. Again, Option 1 –

do nothing – is worst in the ranking. This reflects the fact that doing nothing, i.e. retaining the green-field site – tends to benefit only those residents living in the vicinity of the Enler site, whereas the other options tend to have at least some benefit for the wider community or other groups in the community.

In Matrix 3.4, I present a summary of the people on the estate who can be expected to suffer the negative and enjoy the positive impacts of the implementation of Options 1-6.

Matrix 3.4: Summary of the overall impact of the different options on various groups in the community

<i>Group in the community</i>	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>	<i>Option 4</i>	<i>Option 5</i>	<i>Option 6</i>
Existing residents at Enler site	√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X
New residents at Enler site	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	√/?X
Existing residents at Ballybeen Square	X	√/X	√/X	X	√/X	X
New residents at Ballybeen Square	N/A	√	√	N/A	√	N/A
Existing businesses on the estate	X	√	√	X	√	X
Older people	X	X	√	√	√	X
Young people	√	X	X	√	√	X
People on a low income	X	?	?	√	√	X
Unemployed people	X	√	√	√	√	X
People who have low educational attainment	X	X	X	√	√	X
Whole community on estate	X	√	√	√	√	X
TOTAL	2	4	5	6	8	1

Table 3.4: Ranking of options according to groups of people in the community affected positively

Option	Rank
1	5
2	4
3	3
4	2
5	1
6	6

As can be seen from Table 3.4, Option 5 is ranked first in terms of the number of groups in the community, including the vulnerable, affected positively; it also has a positive effect on the whole community. Option 6 is ranked last, the only group being affected positively by this option being the new residents, although this effect may not be wholly positive in that it does not include the necessary infrastructure to support all new residents' needs. Option 1 is ranked fifth, almost the worst, because this option affects positively only the existing residents at the Enler site, and young people who may use the field for recreation, but it does not bring benefits to the whole community or any of the other vulnerable groups.

A summary of the rankings for Options 1-6 is shown in Matrix 3.5, with an overall ranking in Table 3.5.

Matrix 3.5: Summary of the rankings of Option 1-6 according to the criteria shown in Tables 3.1-3.4

<i>Ranking with respect to:</i>	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>	<i>Option 4</i>	<i>Option 5</i>	<i>Option 6</i>
• number of positive impacts	5	3	2	4	1	6
• number of negative impacts	2	5	=3	=3	1	6
• impacts it is possible to weight	6	=3	2	5	1	=5
• number of groups affected positively	5	4	3	2	1	6

Table 3.5: Overall ranking for Options 1-6

Option	Rank
1	5
2	4
3	2
4	3
5	1
6	6

As can be seen, in terms of impacts on health and well-being for the whole community on the Ballybeen Estate and for some of the vulnerable groups in that community, Option 5 is ranked the best option, and Option 6 is ranked the worst. These findings have been consistent throughout the entire ranking exercise.

3.4 Concluding remarks

According to the analysis in Section 3.3, Option 5 – mixed use, i.e. the provision of day care and community facilities, and retail outlets – appears to offer the most potential for health gain, not only for the whole community but also for various vulnerable groups (e.g. older people, young people and the unemployed). In addition, businesses in and residents living near Ballybeen Square, currently suffering from the negative impacts of vandalism and antisocial behaviour, will also benefit from Option 5.

Option 6 offers very little potential for health gain for the whole community, although it would benefit new residents moving onto the estate. However, the lack of infrastructure currently associated with this option may mean that new residents, although gaining access to good housing conditions, may not have all the facilities, amenities and services on the estate that they might need or require, which could impact on both mental and physical well-being. Moreover, it does not alleviate the situation for businesses in and residents living in near Ballybeen Square.

Option 1 – do nothing, i.e. maintain the green-field site – tends to be localised in its beneficial effects, those residents gaining most from it who live at or near the Enler site. It would not necessarily benefit the whole community, who may not have ready access to the green-field site, and it does not alleviate any of the negative impacts currently occurring at Ballybeen Square, whereas Options 2, 3, and 5 do.

Option 2 – retail outlets only – offers limited health gain for the whole community when compared with Options 3, 4, and 5, and health gain for only a few of the vulnerable, particularly the unemployed. However, it does alleviate the situation for residents at or near Ballybeen Square.

Option 4 – day care and community facilities only – although at first sight seems intuitively to be a better option than Option 3 – day care and retail outlets only – is ranked third below Option 3. This reflects the fact that although there would probably be health gains for the whole community and many of the vulnerable with Option 4 the provision of community facilities and services is not financially viable without income from the retail outlets. This is because the retail outlets are important in terms of employment opportunities for local people and in retaining money in the local economy, both of which are economic determinants of health. Thus, Option 3, which includes retail outlets and the provision of day care for older people on the estate, has the potential for greater health gain than Option 4. In real terms, the potential for health gain inherent in Option 4 may never be realised if the option is not sustainable financially. In addition, Option 4 does not alleviate the situation for businesses in and residents living in near Ballybeen Square, whereas Option 3 does.

In terms of sustainability, although Option 5 offers the possibility of the greatest health gain, it is important to be aware that this option requires the investment of public monies to ensure it is financially viable, although the element of financial sustainability will be provided by the retail outlets included in this option.

3.4.1 Trade-offs

Any decision-making involves trade-offs. For this health impact assessment, the trade-off that has to be considered is the balance of benefit to harm experienced by one group of residents – those living at the Enler site – in relation to the balance of benefit to harm experienced by the whole community. In addition, it is also important to consider the balance of benefit to harm experienced by various vulnerable groups on the estate.

Thus, existing residents at or near the Enler site will suffer from, among other things, the loss of the green-field site both as an amenity and as an aesthetic resource, construction impacts, and may experience vandalism, antisocial behaviour and crime as a result of any of Options 2-6 going ahead. From the consultation events, it would appear that these impacts are uppermost in the minds of residents at the Enler site. However, this potential harm must be balanced against what they would gain from any development on site, such as increased access to goods, services and facilities.

In contrast, the whole community stands to gain more from inward investment into the estate's infrastructure under Options 2, 3, 4, or 5, with the proviso that Option 4 may not be viable financially and therefore may not be able to realise its apparent potential for health gain. People in various vulnerable groups stand to gain under Options 3, 4 and 5, again with the proviso that Option 4 may not be viable financially and therefore may not be able to realise its apparent potential for health gain. However, in terms of the greatest potential gain for the whole community and the greatest number of vulnerable groups Option 5 is best.

However, health impact assessment can help in this difficult situation of trade-offs because the rationale behind undertaking it on a proposal or series of options is to make suggestions about how to alleviate any negative impacts or potential harm and how to enhance any positive impacts or potential benefit. Thus, for each of the options for the development of the Enler site, whatever the ultimate decision, we have presented recommendations to ensure that implementation is as health-protecting and as health-promoting as it is possible to be in the circumstances.

References

- Ison, E. (2002) Rapid appraisal tool for health impact assessment. A task-based approach. Eleventh iteration. Available at: <http://www.hiagateway.org.uk/> under Resources
- Ison E. (2004) Rapid appraisal techniques. In Kemm, J., Parry, J. and Palmer, S. (eds) Health Impact Assessment. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- WHO European Centre for Health Policy (1999) Health Impact Assessment: main concepts and suggested approach. Gothenburg Consensus Paper.

Screening Tool

Belfast Healthy Cities: Pilot in Community Health Impact Assessment

A Prototype Screening Tool for communities living on the Ballybeen Estate

Developed by Erica Ison, The Institute of Health Sciences, Oxford

With support from:

John Adams, William Brooks, Victoria Creasy, Claire Curran, Joan Devlin, Sheelagh Hogg, Annette Kerr, Ian Kerr, Michelle McCann, Jack Mawhinney, Jonna Monaghan, Gabi Mornhinweg, Catherine Morrow, Paula Powell, David Smyth, Johnny Spiers, Mike Wilson

Contents

Introduction

Instructions

Section 1: Significance of the proposal

Summary to Section 1

Section 2: Communities affected by the proposal

Summary to Section 2

Section 3: Impacts on health and well-being

Summary to Section 3

Section 4: Decision-taking framework

Documentation Record

Introduction

What is Screening?

Screening is the first main stage in the classic or traditional process of health impact assessment (HIA). The function of screening is to **select** proposals on which it will be appropriate and/or effective to continue with the process of HIA.

What is a Screening Tool?

A screening tool is a systematic framework against which users can identify the significance of a proposal and its potential impacts. The use of a systematic framework is important because it makes explicit, and therefore transparent, the basis on which a judgement is made about whether to undertake HIA.

Tool Development

This screening tool was developed for communities living in the Ballybeen Estate. Erica Ison constructed the tool using the framework, structure, organisation, and flow she has designed, together with the exercise to help “populate” the tool. However, people who live on the Ballybeen Estate, or people who serve that community from the public and voluntary sectors, suggested the contents for the tool during a workshop run as part of the training in community health impact assessment (CHIA) piloted by Belfast Healthy Cities.

Tool Structure

This screening tool is in four main sections:

- Section 1 – this deals with the significance of the proposal, including a summary of results;
- Section 2 – this deals with the communities affected by the proposal, including a summary of results;
- Section 3 – this deals with the potential impacts of the proposal on health and well-being, including a summary of results;
- Section 4 – an overall summary and decision-taking framework.

For record-keeping purposes, which has a bearing on transparency and accountability of the HIA process, there is a box entitled “Documentation Record” at the end of the tool in which users who have screened the proposal record:

- their names;
- the date on which they screened the proposal;
- the documentation (including the title and date of the document) of the proposal that was used for screening.

Instructions

Number of people required to use the screening tool

One person can complete any screening tool. However, it is advisable for more than one person to be involved because this means that the proposal will be screened making use of several people's knowledge and experience and therefore bringing a wider range of views to bear on the judgement. The result or decision taken is generally strengthened by the fact that it is the consensus view of several people. It is ideal if two or more people screen the proposal, but it is advisable that the group is not too large (no more than 4-5). It is also important that one person is responsible for facilitating the screening process, and for recording the decisions of the group.

Sections of the tool to be completed

All sections of the tool must be completed (Sections 1-4), including the summaries at the end of Sections 1-3, and the Record box at the end of the tool.

How to complete the tool

Sections 1-3

The majority of questions in Sections 1-3 of the tool are based on using a scale. Users should circle the number **or** range in the scale that they think is appropriate. If the question is not applicable to the particular proposal, circle n/a in the last column on the right.

Some of the questions are simpler, involving "Yes/No/Don't know" answers. In these cases, circle the appropriate word.

In all cases, instructions appear in **italic** type after the questions, and sometimes inside the boxes themselves – when instructions appear inside boxes, this indicates where users may have to identify additional items not listed in the tool, e.g. adding in stakeholders.

Section 4

To complete Section 4, users will need to refer to the summaries at the end of Sections 1-3.

Proposal being screened

Please write in the box the title of the proposal being screened.

Section 1: Significance of the proposal

Question 1.1: Is the proposal important to the local community?

Please circle the relevant number or range

			<i>Effect</i>			
	<i>Negative</i>		<i>Neutral</i>		<i>Positive</i>	
Will the proposal be important to local community in terms of:						
• involving them	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• effect on fragmentation in community	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• effect on pockets of deprivation	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• altering perception or reputation of estate	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• effect on health & well-being	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• effect on environment	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• effect on green spaces in estate	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a

Question 1.2: Does the proposal have the potential to cause disruption to the local community?

Please circle the relevant number or range.

			<i>Direction of effect</i>			
	<i>Negative effect</i>		<i>No effect</i>			<i>Positive effect</i>
Does the proposal have the potential for disruption to the community in terms of (see Note 1):						
• existing services – level of provision	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• existing services – standards	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• existing services – affordability	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• existing amenities (see Note 2)	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• existing facilities (see Note 2)	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a

Note 1: If proposal will reduce the level of provision and standards or increase costs, use negative scores; if it will increase the level of provision and standards and decrease costs, use positive scores

Note 2: amenities include shops, Post Offices, banks, credit unions; facilities include leisure and entertainment venues, and community facilities

Question 1.3: Is the proposal significant to the local economy?

Please circle the relevant number or range.

	<i>Effect</i>					
	<i>Negative</i>		<i>Neutral</i>		<i>Positive</i>	
Will the proposal be significant to the local economy in terms of:						
• effect on capacity to attract funding	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• effect on inward investment	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• effect on retention of money in local economy	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a

Question 1.4: Is the proposal significant in terms of the statutory duties, powers, policies/strategies and priorities of local organisations?

Please circle the relevant number or range.

	<i>None</i>					<i>Significant</i>
Is the proposal significant in terms of:						
• statutory duties or powers	0	1	2	3	4	n/a
• key policies or strategies	0	1	2	3	4	n/a
• key priorities	0	1	2	3	4	n/a
• investment	0	1	2	3	4	n/a
• relevance to other stakeholders						

**Question 1.5: Which organisations will be stakeholders in this proposal?
Please tick the appropriate column.**

Stakeholder	Yes	No	Don't know
• Local Strategy Partnership			
• Local Health & Social Care Group			
• Local health & social care providers, e.g. GPs			
• Health Trusts			
• Health & Social Services Board			
• Housing Executive			
• Registered Social Landlords			
• Education & Library Board			
• Schools & nurseries			
• Further & higher education providers			
• Library Board			
• Employment Board			
• Training and Skills Development			
• Regeneration			
• Environmental Health			
• Early Years Services			
• Youth Services			
• Public Transport			
• Community Transport			
• Private Transport			
• Police			
• Fire Service			
• Probation Service			
• Ambulance Service			
• Voluntary Sector			
• Local businesses – Chamber of Commerce			
• Private developers			
• Trade Unions			
• Residential and nursing home providers			
• Community organisations			
• Others? <i>Please list in box below.</i>			

Other Stakeholders – please add other relevant stakeholders to this box:

Question 1.6: Is one or more of the other stakeholders undertaking another form of impact assessment?

Please tick the relevant column, and if another impact assessment is or has been done identify the stakeholder involved.

Impact Assessment	Yes	No	Don't know	Stakeholder
• Environmental (EIA)				
• Economic				
• Social (SIA)				
• Strategic Environmental Appraisal				
• Transport				
• Environmental Health (EHIA)				
• Equality				
• Rural Proofing				
• Other – specify:				

Question 1.7: What resources are needed for proposal implementation?

Please circle the appropriate number or range.

	None				Significant	
Resources:						
• Financial	0	1	2	3	4	n/a
• Human	0	1	2	3	4	n/a
• Material	0	1	2	3	4	n/a
• Training	0	1	2	3	4	n/a

Summary of Section 1

Question 1.1: Importance to the local community

How many categories have a score of -2 ? *Please circle the relevant number.*

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Question 1.2: Disruption to local community

How many categories have a score of -2 ? *Please circle the relevant number.*

0 1 2 3 4 5

Question 1.3: Importance to local economy

How many categories have a score of -2 ? *Please circle the relevant number.*

0 1 2 3

Question 1.4: Significance in context of policies/strategies and investment

How many categories have a score of -2 ? *Please circle the relevant number.*

0 1 2 3 4 5

Question 1.5: Stakeholders involved

How many stakeholders will be involved in proposal implementation? *Please circle the relevant number.*

0 1-4 5-9 10-14 15-19 20-24 25-29 30 or more

Question 1.6: Other impact assessments

How many other impact assessments are being undertaken? *Please circle the relevant number.*

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Question 1.7: Resources required to implement the proposal

How many resource categories will require significant investment in the implementation of the proposal (scores of 3 and 4)? *Please circle the relevant number.*

0 1 2 3 4

Section 2: Communities affected by the proposal

Question 2.1: What impact will the proposal have on the following resident communities?

	<i>Negative impact</i>		<i>No impact</i>		<i>Positive impact</i>	
Ballybeen Estate	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
Carrowreagh ward	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
Enler ward	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
Graham's Bridge ward	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
Others – please specify						
	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a

Question 2.2: What impact will the proposal have on the following vulnerable groups in the community?

	<i>Negative impact</i>		<i>No impact</i>		<i>Positive impact</i>	
• Older people	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Children younger than 5 years	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Children 5-12 years	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Young people 13-18 years	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Young people 19-25 years	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Young men	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Unemployed people	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• People on low income, & their families	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Lone parents, & their families	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Teenage parents	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Homeless people: rough sleepers	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Homeless people: in temporary accommodation	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Homeless people: hidden homeless	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• People with an acute health problem	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• People with a chronic health problem	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• People with a mental health problem	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• People addicted to alcohol	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• People addicted to illicit substances	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• People addicted to prescription drugs	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• People with a physical disability	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• People with a learning disability	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• People with low/no literacy skills	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• People with low/no numeracy skills	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Minority ethnic groups	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Students	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Travellers	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Carers	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a

Summary of Section 2

Question 2.1: Effect on resident communities

Will any resident communities on the Ballybeen Estate be affected negatively (a score of – 2)? *Please circle appropriate answer.*

Yes/No

If the answer is “Yes”, how many communities will be affected? *Please circle appropriate number.*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Question 2.2: Effect on vulnerable groups in the community

How many vulnerable groups in the community will be affected negatively (a score of –2)? *Please circle appropriate number.*

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
24 25 26 27

Section 3: Impacts on health and well-being

Question 3.1: What impacts will the proposal have on health and well-being? Please circle the appropriate number or range.

	<i>Negative impact</i>		<i>No impact</i>		<i>Positive impact</i>	
Direct Effects:						
• Physical health	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Mental health:						
⇒ stress	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ depression	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ self-harm	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ suicide	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
Indirect Effects through:						
• Employment:						
⇒ availability of employment opportunities	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ quality of employment opportunities	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Training and skills development	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Quality of Education:						
⇒ pre-school	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ primary school	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ secondary school	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ further or higher	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ adult and continuing	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Educational Attainment	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Housing:						
⇒ availability of affordable housing	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ conditions						
⇒ fuel poverty	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Transport:						
⇒ accessibility	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ availability	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ affordability	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a

Question 3.1 continued

	Negative impact		No impact		Positive impact	
• Environment:						
⇒ air quality	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ water quality	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ soil quality	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ noise	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ vibration	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ traffic volume	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ traffic congestion	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ landscape	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ monuments	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ estate design	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Crime and community safety:						
⇒ crime	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ fear of crime	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ antisocial behaviour	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ fear of antisocial behaviour	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Culture	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ leisure	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ sport & physical activity	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ arts	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a

Question 3.1 continued

	Negative impact		No impact		Positive impact	
• Access to services						
⇒ healthcare	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ social services	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ respite care	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ childcare	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ education: pre-school	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ education: primary	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ education: secondary	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ education: further or higher	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ education: adult & continuing	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ public transport: availability	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ public transport: affordability	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ level of policing	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ voluntary services	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Access to amenities and facilities:						
⇒ shops	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ bank	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ credit union	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ post office	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ community facilities	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ leisure facilities: availability	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ leisure facilities: affordability	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
• Social environment						
⇒ social networking	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ social support	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a
⇒ community participation	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	n/a

Question 3.2: If the proposal has negative impacts, what kind of negative impacts will they be? Please circle the appropriate number or range.

					Significant	
• Number of people affected	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
• Occurrence of short-term effect(s)	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
• Occurrence of long-term effect(s)	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
• Frequency of effect(s)	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
• Severity of effect(s)	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
• Duration of effect(s)	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
• Combination of effects	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
• Differential effect(s) on vulnerable groups	1	2	3	4	5	n/a

Summary of Section 3

Question 3.1: Impacts on health

Does the proposal have a **direct** negative effect on health, whether mental or physical (a score of -2)? *Please circle appropriate answer.*

Yes/No

Does the proposal have an indirect effect on health (a score of -2 in any category)? *Please circle appropriate answer.*

Yes/No

If so, how many categories have a negative impact of -2? *Please circle appropriate number.*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Question 3.2: Nature of negative impacts

How many of the categories are significant or tending that way (a score of 3-5)? *Please circle appropriate number.*

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Section 4: Decision-taking Framework

Table 4.1: Negative effects on the life of the community, its infrastructure and resources. Please read the questions in the central column, then circle “Yes” or “No” as appropriate.

	Will the proposal:	
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> have a negative effect on issues that are important to the local community? (Question 1.1 – one or more categories with a score of –2) 	No
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> have the potential to cause disruption to the local community? (Question 1.2 – one or more categories with a score of –2) 	No
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> have a negative effect on the local economy? (Question 1.3 – one or more categories with a score of –2) 	No
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> be significant in terms of the policy context in which it will be implemented (Question 1.4 – one or more categories with a score of 3 or 4) 	No

For how many categories in Table 4.1, have you circled “Yes”?

0 1 2 3 4

Table 4.2: Negative effects on health and well-being. Please read the questions in the central column, then circle “Yes” or “No” as appropriate.

	Will the proposal:	
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> have a negative effect on the health & well-being of local communities? (Question 2.1 – one or more local communities with a score of –2) 	No
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> have a negative effect on the health & well-being of vulnerable groups in the community? (Question 2.2 – one or more vulnerable groups with a score of –2) 	No
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> have a negative effect on health through the determinants of health? (Question 3.1 – two or more categories with a score of –2) 	No
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> have significant negative effects on health? (Question 3.2 – one or more categories with a score of 3-5) 	No

For how many categories in Table 4.2, have you circled “Yes”?

0 1 2 3 4

Table 4.3: Demand on resources and involvement of stakeholder organisations. *Please read the questions in the central column, then circle “Yes” or “No” as appropriate.*

	Will the proposal:	
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> involve many other stakeholders? (Question 1.5) 	No
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> be subject/has been subject to other impact assessments? (Question 1.6 – an answer of “Yes” to one or more entries) 	No
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> require significant resources for implementation? (Question 1.7 – a score of 3-5 for one or more categories) 	No

For how many categories in Table 4.3, have you circled “Yes”?

0 1 2 3

Collation of responses to Tables 4.1-4.3
Please fill in the right-hand column.

Table	Number of questions to which the answer was “Yes”
4.1	
4.2	
4.3	

Table 4.4: Deciding Questions. *Please read the questions in the central column, then circle “Yes” or “No” as appropriate.*

	Is the proposal:	
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> at an early stage of design and development, that is, if it is a strategy or policy is it at the consultation stage, and if it is a programme or project is it at an early stage of planning? 	No
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> addressing an issue of local concern or relevance? 	No
	Does the community:	
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> have the opportunity to influence decision-making about the proposal? 	No
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> have the capacity and resources to take the CHIA process further (that is beyond using this tool)? 	No

For how many categories in Table 4.4, have you circled “Yes”?

0 1 2 3 4

4.5: Other Comments. *Please write any other comments below, including whether you think the community would be willing to be involved in this CHIA.*

Documentation Record
Proposal document used for screening:
Date of document:
Proposal screened by:
Date screening took place:

Decision – *please circle appropriate phrase:*

Take forward for HIA/Do not undertake further stages in HIA process